

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES HINES,

Plaintiff, 2:03-cv-2385-GEB-PAN-P

VS.

NUCKLE, et al.,

Defendants. **ORDER**

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262.

On February 8, 2006, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days. After receiving two extensions of time, plaintiff filed objections to the findings and recommendations.¹

¹ In his objections, plaintiff appears to also move to amend his complaint. However, on March 28, 2006, plaintiff filed a motion to amend his complaint. Thus, the motion contained in the objections is duplicative. Plaintiff is advised that the magistrate judge will address the motion to amend by separate order.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-304, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The findings and recommendations filed February 8, 2006, are adopted in full;
 2. Plaintiff's April 26, 2005 motion for summary judgment is denied.

Dated: March 30, 2006

/s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
United States District Judge